

RE: Biological Opinion

Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>

Fri 1/10/2020 8:40 AM

To: Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>

Dear Holly:

Thanks. I believe a Methyl Hg standard is the correct direction for North Dakota. My guess is the methyl Hg will be a low (>0.012 possibly), but 0.012 ug/L for total Hg is too conservative.

Mercury is a bugger. My Hg might have been generated in China and came with an El Nino induced blizzard, enriched with a little extra H₂O and Hg from Denver that melts next spring into my creeks, lakes and wetlands.

I have attached a little light reading. The Whoa Post is a dog newsletter.

Pete

From: Wirick, Holiday <wirick.holiday@epa.gov>**Sent:** Thursday, January 9, 2020 12:43 PM**To:** Wax, Peter N. <pwax@nd.gov>**Subject:** Biological Opinion

CAUTION: This email originated from an outside source. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know they are safe.

Hi Pete, as a follow-up from the call yesterday, attached is the Biological Opinion from the National Marine Fisheries Service on the ESA consultation for water quality toxics standards for Idaho.

As Erica mentioned, NMFS concluded that EPA's chronic WQC for mercury (0.012 ug/L) would not protect aquatic life - and may even jeopardize some of the species - and recommends that Idaho move away from the organic number to a methyl mercury number.

The section on mercury and methylmercury is on p. 144-162.

Thanks. Talk with you soon.

Holly Wirick
Water Quality Section
U.S. EPA – Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202
(303) 312-6238